

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,530	06/25/2003	Sophie Wastiaux	Serie 6126	2185
75	90 12/20/2005		EXAM	INER
Linda K. Russell			COOKE, COLLEEN P	
Air Liquide 2700 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Houston, TX 77056			1754	

DATE MAILED: 12/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Astion Commons	10/603,530	WASTIAUX ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Colleen P. Cooke	1754				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 O	ctober 2005.					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	/ _					
• "	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
· <u> </u>						
,	 4) Claim(s) 22-25 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 24 and 25 is/are withdrawn from consideration. 					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
, <u> </u>						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	6) Claim(s) 22 and 23 is/are rejected.					
•	r)					
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		• •				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/12/05.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 22 and 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Insomuch as any arguments made might apply to the new grounds of rejection, Bland et al. as cited below does in fact teach, in two different embodiments, that a joining piece (12 or 31) is **externally welded** (welds 21 or 41) to a piece of equipment (18 or 37) and wherein the joining piece (12 or 31) is protected over at least part of the surface by a protective coating **prior to** the welding (21 or 41). These details are taught by Bland et al. in the following portions which are also cited in the ground of rejection further below: Column 2, lines 24-26; Column 2, lines 49-52; Column 3, lines 44-45; Column 3, lines 58-60.

Election/Restrictions

Newly submitted claims 24-25 directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: Claims 22-23, drawn to a method of protecting equipment from corrosion, are independent from claims 24-25, drawn to an apparatus for generating synthesis gas from a hydrocarbon mixture because the method of claims 22-23 is not limited to generated a synthesis gas from a hydrocarbon mixture and can be used to make equipment suitable for most any use, for example semiconductor processing.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 24-25 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Art Unit: 1754

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bland et al. (2895747).

With respect to claims 22-23, Bland et al. teaches different embodiments which anticipate the claims.

In first embodiment, Bland et al. teaches (see Figures 1-3), a method of protecting pieces of equipment (11 and 18) where the pieces have been protectively coated (14) and are joined to each other by welding (21) of the pieces together with a joining piece (12) which also has the protective coating (14) thereon. More specifically, Bland et al. teaches that after coating the member 11 and joining piece 12 (Column 2, lines 24-26) weld 21 is made joining members 11, 18, and 12 integrally (Column 2, lines 49-52). The equipment pieces and joining pieces are all steel, and the protective coating shown in the figures is an aluminum coating (Column 3, lines 38-41 particularly).

In a second embodiment, Bland et al. teaches (see Figure 4) a method of protecting pieces of equipment (32, 37) where the pieces have been protectively coated (38, 34) and are joined to each other by welding (41) of the pieces together with joining pieces (39, 31) which also have the protective coating (34) thereon. More specifically, Bland et al. teaches that the pipe 32 and

Art Unit: 1754

ring 31 are coated with aluminum (Column 3, lines 44-45) and after that pipe 37 is placed in position and a weld (41) is made to join pipes 32 and 37 and to weld ring 33 to the pipes (Column 3, lines 58-60). The equipment pieces and joining pieces are all steel, and the protective coating shown in the figures is an aluminum coating (Column 3, lines 38-41 particularly).

Regardless of which embodiment is relied upon, further limitations including fluids to be used in the equipment made, use in high temperature processes and the process in which the equipment made may be used merely recite intended use as claimed; nonetheless it would appear the method of Bland et al. would provide equipment capable of performing these intended uses as claimed since Bland et al. teaches that the equipment is known to have widespread use "in chemical reactors and the like and particularly in reactors associated equipment which are alternately exposed to reducing and oxidizing atmospheres" (column 1, lines 22-25).

With respect to portion "a" of claim 22, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 312 F.2d 937, 939, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by GB 824717.

GB 824717 teaches the process of producing corrosion-resistant equipment, specifically metal hollow bodies to be welded (page 1, lines 56-70) and refers specifically to carbon steel, iron

Art Unit: 1754

pipe (page 1 lines 34 and 50), and further specifically defines the components of the figures as being carbon steel and corrosion resistant steel (page 2, lines 99-106). GB 824717 teaches (see Figure 2 or 3) that the components are connected by butt-welding (2) sleeves 3a and 3b together which sleeves are butt-welded(4) to components 1a and 1b and further that components 1a and 1b are protectively coated (5) and that the protective coating (5) covers at least a portion of the joining pieces (sleeves 3a and 3b); in Figure 2 the protective coating (5) is shown to partially cover sleeves 3a and 3b though the overlapping portion has no reference number while in Figure 3 the protective coating (5) is shown to partially cover sleeves 3a and 3b as shown by reference number 4a.

Further limitations including fluids to be used in the equipment made, use in high temperature processes and the process in which the equipment made may be used merely recite intended use as claimed; nonetheless it would appear the method of GB 824717 would provide equipment capable of performing these intended uses as claimed since GB 824717 teaches that the equipment is known to be produce "hollow metal bodies, such as containers, apparatus, or pipelines for corrosive liquid or solid substances, gases, or vapours, mixtures, or suspensions" (page 1, lines 56-60).

With respect to portion "a" of claim 22, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art.

Application/Control Number: 10/603,530 Page 6

Art Unit: 1754

See *In re Casey*, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 312 F.2d 937, 939, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Colleen P Cooke whose telephone number is 571-272-1170. She can normally be reached Mon.-Thurs. 8am-6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, her supervisor, Stan Silverman can be reached at 571-272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Colleen P Cooke Primary Examiner Art Unit 1754